24

Control of the contro

coris in guina

NEW HAMPSHIRE LAW LIBRARY

1951

SEP 0 3 1998

Hovember 29

CONCORD, N.H.

Frederick H. Clarke, Commissioner, Motor Vehicle Department State House Annex

Dear Mr. Clarke:

You have inquired what effect an executive pardon of a person whose license had been revoked following his conviction of operating under the influence of intoxicating liquor would have upon his eligibility for restoration of license prior to expiration of the statutory period of mendatory suspension. In my opinion an executive pardon would have no effect upon eligibility for license.

It has been held that an executive pardon to a physician convicted of manulaughter, whose license to practice medicine was revoked because of such conviction, does not restore the right to practice, although it purports to restore all the rights and privileges forfeited by the conviction. 47 A.L.R. 538. A similar result has been reached in the case of an attorney who had been disbarred by reason of a conviction. Id., 543.

I have been unable to discover any decision covering the situation with which you are concerned. A pardoned felon was denied a license to operate a taxicab on the ground that his previous conviction of crime established a bad character. Id. 541. The effect of this decision is weakened, however, by the observation that no forfeiture of the license before the pardon was shown. I believe, nevertheless, that restoration of eligibility for license to operate a motor vehicle can well be argued to be controlled by the same principles as those applied in the cases of the physician and the attorney.

The power of pardoning offenses is vested in the Governor and Council. Constitution of New Hampshire, Part Second, Art. 52. The Legislature may not impair or curtail the power of pardon granted by the Constitution. But a license to operate a motor vehicle is a privilege, not a right (State v. Sterrin, 78 N.H. 222), concerning the eligibility for which the Legislature has established xtatutory conditions. In determining eligibility of applicants the Commissioner is given broad discretion. R.L. 1942, c. 117, s. 2, 3; c. 118, s. 33. But his discretion is limited by provisions for mandatory suspension. R.L., c. 118, ss. 13, 16. It is

November 20

decision of the Commissioner to the Superior Court, but that this at license of allowed where the suspension or revocation is mandatory. R.T. noted that a person whose license has been revoked or suspended may The intent of the law is clearly to make mandatory the revocation of one convicted of operating under the influence and his ineligibilit! cense for one year thereafter.

peal the al is not

The fact that a license is a privilege, to be en under certain circumstances, is further indicated by the requirement of poll tax and by the minimum age requirement. C. 117, as, 3, 4.

yed only of payment

To hold that an executive pardon would restore e for license would, in effect, constitute eligibility for license as Euch a result would seriously impair, if not destroy, the integrity ministrative procedure established by the Legislature.

gibility , right. if the ad-

My conclusion is that an executive pardon of a pull victed of operating under the influence of intoxicating liquor would the mandatory provisions for revocation of license.

rson connot affect

Very truly yours,

Maurice M. Blodgett Deputy Attorney General

MMP: FP